



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/079,114

02/20/2002

Johann Winderl

MAS-FIN-116

6732

7590

12/29/2003

LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.

Post Office Box 2480

Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

MUNSON, GENE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/79, 114

Applicant(s)

J. WINDERL ET AL

Examiner

G. MUNSON

Group Art Unit

2811

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4 September, 14 October 2003
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 26 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 14, 15, 17 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7, 6-13, 16, 36 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
- in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2811

Examination is continued under 37 CFR 1.114.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 14, 15 and 17 are allowed over the art of record

Claims 8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The structure of the "dendritic structure" (claim 8), "bonding channel" (claims 11, 12) and "conductor tracks" (claim 13) are unclear from the specification (pages 7-9, 21, 23, 26), which does not enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the structure, and are not shown in the figures (37 CFR 1.83).

Contrary to the remarks (pages 12-14) which accompany the amendment, filed 4 September 2003 and now entered, the "profile-sawn contours" encompass "straight cuts" and a "straight line", since claim 1 does not limit the scope of "profile" of the "contours". Perhaps the scope of "profile" in claim 1 is broader than intended. Compare claim 1 with the allowed claims.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2811

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Dando. See Figure 8 with "plastic composition" 38, which extends into an "edge portion" of an "active upper side" (claim 26).

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Dando. It would have been obvious to use a semiconductor chip with "plastic composition" material 38 of Dando (Figure 8), in order to cover the semiconductor edge with an insulating material. It would have been obvious to implement a contact sensor (claim 10) with a semiconductor chip as in Dando.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Dando as in the above rejection further considered with Saitoh. It would have been obvious to use chromium oxide to enhance adhesion between a semiconductor die and plastic as noted as known in Saitoh (column 2, lines 28-36).

Art Unit: 2811

Claims 1, 4, 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Brooks et al. See Figure 12 with "plastic composition" 110. Note that claim 1 does not preclude encapsulation 110 covering an "active upper side"

Claims 1, 16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Japanese document 2144946 abstract, with "plastic composition" 7.

The references are of record.

The arguments in the remarks have been considered, but are not persuasive, as noted above. Contrary to the remarks (pages 10-11), the specification does not appear to refer to the cited patents.

Munson
(703) 308-4925 or 0956

12/22/03



GENE M. MUNSON
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2811